



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/006,952	11/05/2001	David Kammer	035451-0169 (3707.Palm)	035451-0169 (3707.Palm) 2782	
26371	7590 02/21/2006		EXAMINER		
FOLEY & I	LARDNER LLP	SAMS, MATTHEW C			
—	ISCONSIN AVENUE				
SUITE 3800			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
MILWAUKEE, WI 53202-5308			2643		
			DATE MAILED: 02/21/2004	DATE MAIL FD: 02/21/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/006,952	KAMMER, DAVID		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Matthew C. Sams	2617		

	Matthew C. Sams	2617	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence ado	ress
THE REPLY FILED 01 February 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	ving replies: (1) an amendment, aff tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in o e with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply mu	idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
 a) The period for reply expires months from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire land 	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejecti	on.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	06.07(f).		
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropr inally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any external notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further co	nsideration and/or search (see NO		ecause
 (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo (c) They are not deemed to place the application in befappeal; and/or 		ducing or simplifying	the issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally rej	ected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.13	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)			
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be al non-allowable claim(s). 			
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is protected that the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		ll be entered and an	explanation of
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good answas not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	t before or on the date of filing a North of the date of the affidate of the a	otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> vit or other evidence i	ot be entered s necessary and
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attac	hed.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowa	nce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).13. ☐ Other:	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper N	lo(s)	

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Hendrey states that the "aspects of the invention relate to methods and systems for automatically and/or selectively initiating communications among mobile users in a telecommunications system that has the ability to determine a geographic location of mobile users." (Col. 1 lines 15-19), with selectively being the key word. Fig. 2 of Hendrey shows the telecommunication unit (201) connected to the telecommunication infrastructure (210), with the telecommunication unit capable of initiating connections selective to distance information (Col. 3 lines 34-36). Hendrey teaches the caller can dynamically generate a list, determine how many users to list, selectively connect to other users based on distance and have access to the "matchmaker" functions including distance information. (Col. 12 lines 38-56 and Col. 18 lines 6-14). Therefore, it is the examiner's opinion that Bork in view of Hendrey teaches combination of steps of claim 1 as seen on Pages 7-8 of the Applicant's remarks. Since the examiner views the "telecommunication unit" as encompassing a "local area computing device" and Hendrey specifically states a PDA and laptop as being examples of a "telecommunication unit" that contains a processor (Fig. 1 [101a-d], Col. 4 lines 40-53 and Col. 23 lines 42-45), the arguments regarding claims 8, 16 and 24 are considered the same as claim 1. Since the arguments regarding claims 6, 14, 22, 30 and 31 contain no new information, the original rejections are maintained in view of the further explanation.

LESTER G. KINCAID SUPERVISORY PRIMARY EXAMINER